

RICHARD E. O'DONNELL,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.) No. 4:08CV363 TCM
)
ST. LOUIS COUNTY DEPARTMENT)
OF JUSTICE SERVICES, et al.,)
)
Defendants.)

Before the Court is plaintiff’s motion to “revise and amend complaint appeal order,” which the Court will liberally construe as a post-dismissal motion to amend his complaint.¹

¹Although plaintiff uses the term “appeal” in his motion for relief, he has not articulated in his motion a desire to appeal the Court’s dismissal of his complaint. To the extent that plaintiff wishes to appeal the dismissal, he should file a separate notice of appeal in accordance with the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure as outlined in the Court’s May 1, 2008 correspondence to plaintiff.

accountable for any and all “wrongs” committed against him. As explained in the Court’s Opinion, Memorandum and Order, these administrators cannot be held liable just by virtue of being “in charge.” *See Boyd v. Knox*, 47 F.3d 966, 968 (8th Cir. 1995) (respondeat superior theory inapplicable in § 1983 suits). For these reasons, and for the reasons espoused in the Court’s Opinion, Memorandum and Order, the Court will deny plaintiff’s post-dismissal motion to amend his complaint.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff’s motion to “revise and amend complaint appeal order,” liberally construed as a post-dismissal motion to amend plaintiff’s complaint, is **DENIED**.

Dated this 7th day of May, 2008.



HENRY EDWARD AUTREY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE